## JOINT COMMUNION.

LETTERS FROM DR. DRUMM, BISHOP POT-TER, AND OTHERS.

THE REY, DR. DRUMM DISCUSSES THE AUTHORITIES CITED BY BISHOP CUMMINS AND "HISTORICUS"-

THEIR CLAIMS AS EVIDENCE DISALLOWED. To the Right Rev. GRONGE DAVID CUMMINS, D. D., Assistant Biskop of Kentucky.

RIGHT REVEREND SIR: I turn now to your second letter, dated Oct. 16, in which you undertake to furnish proof of the statement that I challenged. With it the letter of Historieus will be considered also, first, because you have added nothing in your own name, and second, because that letter and yours traverse the same ground; at least Historicus has given nearly all your matter, has given it in more convenient form, and has added to it much matter of the same kind. But what is that kind! Is it what the public had a right to expect from you! You made a positive assertion respecting the law and discipline of your own Church in the eixteenth century, and when asked to establish the truth of that assertion, you point to others who have made it. You say it is "sustained in galmost iden tical words" by Professor Fisher of Yale College, " the intest and most scholarly English historian of the Reformation;" and you quote, to the same effect, Macaulay, Keble, Hallam, Burnet and others. But what

of all this! You surely do not expect that I or the pubhe will be satisfied so easily. You do not expect me to receive such quotations as proofs of your assertion. Do you know of any court of justice where such evidence would be admitted? In the case of a man on trial for murder, what would you yourself think of the prosecuting attorney who would strive to prove him guilty by showing that other people said he was guilty! Of course no lawyer would dream of offer-ing such evidence, and no judge would admit it, d yet, Sir, such is the only additional evidence you have presented as to this very important matter of fact. In a letter to which you appended your official signature, you assured the public that the Church of England for many years "admitted to parishes" persons who had only Presbyterian ordination, and when required to prove what you thus affirmed, you tell us that there is a gentleman at Yale College who says the same thing, and that there were several others in England who said it. I leave our readers to decide whether I would not be at perfect liberty to east out all such matter, and, in the becace of any other evidence, to claim the verdict. But, Sar, I shall not take this course, for you or your friends might say that I avoided, through fear of their force, the quotations you have made. To show you that this is not the case I hereby, with great pleasure, help you to some additional "authorities" of the same kind. First in importance among them is the late Rev. Dr. Goode, Dean of Ripon, wh and: "Until the period of the Restoration (1602), minis-ters of the Scotch and Poreign non-Episcopal Churches admitted to the cure of souls in our Church without

This statement was duly echoed by a number of reverend gentlemen in this country, who seemed to regard Dr. Goode as an infallible guide in all such matters. For astance, by the Rev. Dr. R. Newton of Philadelphia io a sermon preached and published in 1860. It was also re peated by the Rev. Dr. Tyng of New-York in his reply t Elshop Potter's pastoral letter in 1865. It was echo the Rev. Dr. P. H. Canfield of Brooklyn, who, in his reply to Bishop Potter on the same occasion, said: "Every well-informed person knows that \* \* \* for the first hundred years after the Reformation, those having only Presbyterian Orders were admitted without re ordination to livings and benefices in the Church and Universities of England." Not being a "well-informed person," I did not know this, and so took the liberty of esting a private letter to Dr. Canfield asking for proof or further information. He replied saving that he was cugaged in preparing a larger pamphlet, in which he sent me a copy of this additional reply to Bishop Potter, and there I found the "authority" the reverend gentleman had to offer. It read thus: "The validity of these con-Episcopal orders was recognized in the Church of England for upward of one hundred years, by allowing those thus ordained to hold livings to preach and to administer the sacraments of that Church." And to thi repetition of his fermer statement the reverend gentle man added three of the same extracts that you and His-

You have therefore the pleasure of knowing that there is al least one other elergyman whose idea of proof corresponds with yours. In 1867 the Rev. Dr. Newton eached and published another sermon in which he re peated the statement "in almost identical words." He was followed by his son, the Rev. R. H. Newton, aforementioned, who repeated it in terms as positive. It was lso asserted in several publications by a certain Rev Mr. Gallagher, whose principles led him at last to resign

Now these are all willing witnesses, and they speak with no uncertain sound. Their dicta are at least as good, and in fact ought to be better than those of Prof. Fisher and Lord Macaulay and Mr. Hallam, because to know more of the history of their own Church that laymen or non-Episcopalians. I cheerfully bestow then upon you. Sir. and, if you desire it, will find you a few more "authorities" of the same kind, quite as strong -and just as worthless!

score of extracts from modern authors, who in ser-

mons, and pamphlets, and books have denied what Halam, and Macaulay, and Goode bave affirmed; but what would be gained in the end by any such balancing of or that made certain assertions, but whether the assertions are true. We are considering a matter of fact, not of opinion, and therefore we require evidence, not as sertions. I refuse, therefore, Sir, to waste time with least something that looks like an attempt to substanti nte what is said. But before taking up any of them al low me to say, Right Reverend Sir, that I am surprised at the way in which you and Historicus make your ap peal to books. I expected that what you would furnish would be the fruit of your own labor in research, but I am sorry to say that you have left very difficult for me to believe that you have examined the books from which you quote. It is not strange, Sir, that you and your anonymou defender should quote the same passages, for they are the common stock in trade; but it is a little remarkable that you should both quote from precisely the same editions. Some of them are scarce and expensive books For instance, Ficetwood & Parker, and Strype & Keble's equion of Hooker. This last named has be printed in this country in two volumes, and the ordinary edition (not Keble's) is in more general use, but it would seem as if you and Historicus both had the Oxford edition in three volumes. Strype's Annals in four volume folios is a work that is not found in every clergyman's library ; yet to judge by the quotations the public would suppose that you and Historicus both have it at hand at it is a little singular that in citing the passage from it, Historieus gives the volume and the page, but does not name the book, though Strype wrote eight or nine works that are all important. That might appear a mere oversight, however, if the very same peculiarity did no distinguish Mr. Gallagher's mode of quoting the same passage in one of his booklets published in 1851 Set, mention the work, but in comm with Historieus and Mr. Gallagher, you give "page 514.

page 514 contains no such matter as you quote from it petuated tells where the last quoter got his information There are other inaccuracies or defects, which show either that you have conducted your own search in a very careiess manner, or that you have depended en to you, but tends to lessen the confidence of the reader and greatly increases the labor of the person who under takes to answer you. For instance, Historicas refer me (without naming volume or page) to the Zurich Let-ters for a sentence from Peter of Perugia. I searched both volumes carefully twice over for that sentence, but in vain. At last I turned to what are always known and quoted as the "Original Letters," and there, in Vol. I., age 33s, I found it. I have made two journeys of forty miles each to search for a copy of Archbishop Parker's "Autiquitates Brittanica," yet could not succeed in find ing it. But Historicus had no difficulty in giving a long extract from it in good modern English. It would have saved some fruitless trouble if he had been so kind as to state where he found that edition. In the case of Macaulay, Hallam, Burnet, Fleetwood, and Hall, beside those already mentioned, the editions are not specified. e of Cosin, the reference is to "page 231, American Edition," of a letter containing about 30 tines! But these are comparative trifles, which we would willingly overlook if in other respects your work were well done. Leaving them, then, I proceed to examin

The quotation from Archbishop Parker contains montion of the fact that Bucer, Martyr, &c., were appointed to positions in the Universities. We need not touch upon them again, but deal with the others, whose unes are here introduced, viz.: Paul Fagius, Tremellius, Bernardine Ochmo, Peter Alexander, and Valerandus Pollanus. Now the presumption is that

these were all appointed to parishes in England, and that they were all " Presbyterian divines," else surely it is useless to bring them in. Let us see, then.

It is not easy (as you know, Sir) to get particulars of the lives of these men, yet what we can get gives not a particle of support to your assertion. Fagius and Tre-mellius were teachers of Hebrew. If giving them that position involved recognition of them as validly or-dained ministers, then the same Universities have several times given like testimony to the full ministerial character of Jews! Valerandus Pollanus had no appointment whatever in the Universities or Church of England. He was "Superintendent" of the Church of the French and Walloon Exiles at Glastonbury. Peter Alexander was a priest, and had been chaplain to Queen Mary, the Emperor's sister. (Original Letters, i., 67.) Bernardine Ochino was born in Sienna, A. D. 1487, entered the religious order of Capuchins, and, in course of time, came to be its General. He was regarded as the most eloquent preacher of the day. He was the friend of Cardinals, and even the Confessor of Pope Paul III. In his 55th year he became a Protestant, and now he is

Set forth as a Presbyterian divine!

The next item furnished is the statement that in the reign of Edward VI. a church composed of foreigners with a Presbyterian ministry was placed under the charge of the Bishop of London, and has thus remained to the present day. There is room for doubt as to whether that Presbyterian Church submits to the authority of the present Bishop of London. I fancy not. But what is proved by the fact as you state it ? Does it help your position? Were those foreigners admitted to parishes in the English Church on the ground of their Presbyterian orders; if not, why are they introduced ex-cept to confuse the argument!

Let the fact be known by every one that England recived hospitably those who for the holding of the faith of Christ were obliged to flee from their own lands, that the Archbishops and the King were very kind to those copie, and allowed them to follow their own usages i worship. And yet, Sir, even this was not done so com pletely as you may suppose. Lest the disadvantages of the non-Episcopal mode should show themselves too plainly, the refugees were obliged to submit to a sort of Episcopacy, like that of the Methodists and the European Lutherans now. Their first "superintendents" were John A'Lasko and Valerandus Pollanus, already named, and Bishop of the Diocese where they lived, or Archbishop of Canterbury, had supervision of all. The ministers of these people, in place of being permitted, as you seem to suppose, to go among the Er glish and teach them their system, were strictly forbidden to take any such course. They were tolerated not as Presbyteriaus, but as exiles; and so they were strictly charged to confine themselves to their own language, and not in any way to intermeddle with the church affairs of the country that gave them asylum church affairs of the country that gave them asymm; but I am sorry to say that they were ungrateful, and sometimes abused the privileges afforded them. That the Bishops were occasionally compelled to use their authority, you will see in the Life of Sandys, as well as in Collier's History, follo, Vol. II., pages 292, 532, 513. But to proceed with your defense. You offer me Mr. Hallam as a witness. If he adduces proof of what he ays, he will be heard; if not, not. He gives none, and

so I set him aside. In the same manner and on yet better grounds I eight dismiss Lord Macaulay who was so full of party sentation of church affairs; but as his statement is made by some others that you quote, and is in itself of great importance to you, it will be fully examined a little

further on. His own Times. Allow me to say that there is no work of the kind extant, from the unsupported statements of which it would be harder to arrive at a just conclusion on any matter whereon the Whigs or Latitudinarian Churchmen had any interest. The book is a repertory of gossip and partial representations, and is full of inaccuracies. If, however, you are not satisfied with my judgment, read Salmon's examination of it, in 2 vols. svo, or Higgons's Critique. Even Dean Swift's notes will help you to decide whether it is worth much as an authority. Yet still, Sir, we will hear what he has to furnish in the way of evidence. Historicus says Burnet testified that up to 1661 "those who care to England had not been required to be reordained among us." In 1961 he was 18 years of age, and had never been in England in his life. A very sufficient witness, then, to what had been done "among us" previous to that date!

Historicus gives another quotation from him to the ffect that no Scotch bishop even so much as desired any of the Presbyterians to be ordained. He testifies very freely, you see, as to the thoughts and desires of other men, but the testimony, beside being very ques-tionable, is wholly irrelevant. We are not concerned with what Scotch bishops required fof Scotch Presbyte rians, but with the attitude which the Church of England maintained toward non-Episcopal ministers who

might wish to enter her service. Very loath would I be to set John Strype on the sam level with the meddlesome, gossipy Burnet; and yet he is more distinguished for honesty as a compiler than for judgment. He is often in error, and would mislead his other people's opinions, when he ought to give facts only. The quotations you make from him I regard as an instance of this. It is not accurately quoted in the as his record of what was alleged in behalf of Travers whose plea will be considered presently. The settling of that case will dispose of whatever Strype says in con-nection with it. But his own Life of Whitgift supplies the best correction of the mistake made in the passage

you quote from him. Bishop Fleetwood, though a partisan on the same side as Burnet, deserves entire credence when he states things that he had opportunity of knowing. The quotation from his works fairly represents his opinions, but cannot furnish testimony. For observe, you say, on the authority of Macaulay and these others, that the Church became distinctively Episcopal in 1661, but that previou to that year she admitted non-Episcopal ministers to parochial cures. Then, also, it must have been previous to 1641 for after that date she was under the iron heel of the Puritan. We are thus thrown back to a time concerning which Fleetwood can give no testimony Writing in 1712, he, a man of 56, pretends to tell what took place at the very least 16 years before he was born. He must depend, then, upon either documents or hearsay-if the former, why did he not refer to them; if the

It is easy to show that his statement could not be correct, and that from his own words in the very sentence of which Historicus quotes the larger part. He says the foreign Presbyterian ministers were admitted "not-withstanding the Thirty-nine Articles, notwithstanding the rubries, and notwithstanding the canons!" If so then they were illegally admitted, and their case cannot be pleaded as proving the point at issue. Bishop Cosin is also quoted, but whether fairly or not is not certain. The letter to M. Cordel has never been properly authenticated, nevertheless we may consider it In it he says he knew some cases of persons who with only Presbyterian orders, were admitted to parishes, and that he "could instance many others before his time." It is greatly to be regretted then that he did not specify even one of the many, or of those of actual evidence which hitherto we have not had. The mere general statement counts for nothing, especially as in Birch's Life of Tillotson, Cosin is represented as giving the case of Whittingham for an example. This case will be examined when I have gone through all that you and your friend have published, and it will show how little value, after all, attaches to the assertion

in Cosin's letter, if it be his Bishop Hall is also cited to testify, and like Costn makes a general statement. Not one actual instance is mentioned. The conclusion cannot, in fairness, be avoided then that these two men did not speak from accurate personal knowledge, but from impressions which the Puritans had labored to create and foster, or from actual cases of illegal admission to benefices, cases that would not bear the light. Historicus has made another reference, which on the ground of irrelevance should be ruled out; I mean the following statement respecting

the Synod of Dort:

The position of the Church of England was shown in
the Evangelical Alliance at Dort, when Bishop Carleton
and Drs. Hall, Davenant, and Ward received the elements at the hands of the Presbyterian Moderator.
Bogerman, Dr. Hall preaching the sermon and declaring
that there was no place so near Heaven as Dort and
where he would so much like to dwell.

Will you allow me to sake Sir what possible belough the

Will you allow me to ask. Sir, what possible help this can give you in defense of your statement that Presbyterian ministers were admitted to parishes in England Does it prove that Bogerman was invited to England and installed in some comfortable rectory, or appointed to a Mishopric? Of course you see that it has nothing whatever to do with the subject of our correspondence, but is introduced as a quasi justification of your recent action in the matter of Joint Communion, which I assure you it was not my intention to make the subject of newspaper discussion. But as this supposed precedent has en set forth in a letter which I am expected to answer, t too shall be carefully considered.

In the first place, Sir, you will observe that Historoes not say there was any "long to the constant of the constant of

does not say there was any "joint communion" at Dort. He implies it, but does not say it, and it might possibly be claimed that doctrinal "elements" were meant. I take it for granted, however, that he referred to administration of floty Communion in the Synod, at which the consecration &c.. were performed by the

Moderator. It would have been more to the credit of Historious if he had given his Jauthority for saying or implying that any such thing ever took place. Please to observe that I do not positively deny it, but he does not offer the least evidence and I cannot find any. There may be some somewhere, but if so it is, to say the least, remarkable that I have not been able to discover it in the Acta Synodi, nor in Scott's Translation with History prefixed, nor in the Presbyterian Dr. Miller's elaborate argument for acknowledgment of Presbyterian Orders, based on the English divines sitting in that Synod, nor in Bishop Hall's Life, nor in Bishop Carleton's vindication of his own course at Dort; nor in Brandt's History, which eccupies a folio volume, and takes cognizance of minute particulars. It is possible, however, that your friend may have some authority for making such a reference. I cannot positively deny it; and you know, Sir, I am not bound to prove a negative. But I cau, at least, show so much inaccuracy in the statement of your friend as to make it very doubtful whether he took it from any trustworthy source. His language implies as clearly as possible that it was at the time of the sacramental service Dr. Hall preached "the sermon," and declared there was no place so near heaven as Dort. Now. Sir, the fact is that Dr. Hall's sermon was not preached on any such occasion. It was derivered on the 29th of November, 1618, and there was no communion administered them. And his complimentary reference to the place or the Synod was not made in that sermon, but in his farewell speech on the IIth of the following

preached on any such occasion. It was derivered on the 29th of November, 1618, and there was no communion administered then. And his compilmentary reference to the place or the Synod was not made in that sermon, but in his farewell speech on the 17th of the following January! (See Brandt, Hist. Reform, fol., Vol. III., pace 39, &c., &c., Report of Seasion (2)

There is on the records of the Synod a reference to Communion, to the following effect: Balthazar Lydius, minister of the Church at Dort, acquainted the Synod that the Holy Secrament yaq about to be administered in his church, and he and his People desired the Synod to meet with them. A similar invitation was given by the minister of the Walloon Church, but no action whatever appears to have been taken. (See Brandt as above, p. 132.) And the only thing that looks like fellowship at the same table was the decidedly unspiritual feast given at the close of the proceedings:

"When the whole Synod was plentifully treated with mean and drink and a noble dessert of all sorts of sweetments, and their ears cuterianced with agreeable music.

" of or which purpose several musicians were sent for out of the adjacent towns, and women, who sung behind the curiain. " A" The Remonstrants say it was thus that the fathers of the Synod washed away with Rhenish wine and chased away with music the remorse that probably had been occasioned by depriving so many ministers of their cures and of their bread."

And they say yet more, Sir, which I have no wish to quote.

And they say yet more, so quote.

Anxious as I am to have done with this correspondence, I would thank you to furnish proof of this other most important assertion (made in your vandeation by Historicus), that "Bishop Carleton and Drs. Hail, Devenant, and Ward received the elements at the hands of the Presbyterian Moderator, Bogerman, Dr. Hail preaching the serious and declaring," &c., &c.

This Synod matter was introduced for the purpose of providing you with a precedent, and unplying that the

This Synod matter was introduced for the purpose of providing you with a precedent, and implying that the English Church recognized the validity of Presbyterian Orders. Permit me to say, Sir, that these subjects have been unnecessarily dragged is. I challenged one statement that you had made, and did not expect that in place of proving it you or your friend would go about to prove other thiese. But if you desire to investigate, or to discuss the question respecting validity, &c., I would take the liberty of directing your attention to Vox Ecclesiae, a book which I would not have alluded to if it had not been mamed as mine by Historicus. What I have to say on "validity" is said there. The question that has been carefully and thoroughly considered in a good-sized volume need not be opened up anew in a letter to The Themure.

If the had not been named as mine by Historieus. What I have to say on "validity" is said there. The question that has been carefully and thoroughly considered in a good-sized volume need not be opened up anew in a letter to The Tribune.

But, Sir, as Historieus considers that the fact of Caurch dignitaries taking part in the discussions at the Synod of Dort shows "the position of the Charch of England," I beg leave to correct him and to remind you that the Caurch of England had no more to do with their presence there than it had to do with Dean Smyth's recent visit to New York. King James sent them, and because he desired to have Conrad Vorstins condemned, he selected persons who held Calvimstic doctrines. "But still," you may say, "their presence and participation in the business of that assembly show that they reognized those wao sai with them as validly ordained ministers." By no means, Sir, for there were many members of that synod who made no prefence to be ministers. If the presence of the English divines involved the recognition of the Orders of Engerman and Gomarus, it changed the lay delegates into dergyment. In one sense, Sir, I am willing to acknowledge that "the position of the Courch of England" was shown in that Synod. You are probably aware, Sir, that the approval of the Betgit Confession was part of the programme, and that that confession was part of the programme, and that that confession contains a declaration of ministerial parity. Did the English divines give their assent to this article I had late Rev. Dr. Miler of Princeton said they do!, but those gentlemen were not careful to secretain the train of their statements. In place of the English divines subscribing to those articles, the Synod itself did not act on them. Out of regard for the well-known principles of the English Caurch it was determined to omit from the reading of that Confession the articles toaching church government, and the molerator expressly stated that the doctrinal articles alone were to be considered. Was not such a project even against the articles that were dropped from the Confession. Bishop Caricton, in the name of his brethren, made the protest. He claimed that Episcopacy was the divinely instituted form of Church government and the only one that had existed until recently in Christendom. And he expressed the opinion that the trouble they were suffering in Holland was caused by the want of Episcopal supervision. How was thus revelved. Sirt Did they ery out against him as a higoted High Chorchman! Did they even declare their conscientions preference for their own polity! No. Sir! To the culogy on the Episcopal mode the President replied, "My Lord, we are not so happy!"

order and distribute which obtained in the Church of high and, and that they wished with all their hearts that the auto-order were likewise actued and observed there, but that they durst not hope for such a thing in the present situation of arfarts."

Says Bistop Carlaton;

"This was the answer that they gave me, and this, I think, sufficiently untiles them, and shows that they are not load of nopular cannation and a government vaid of all authority. They grous under the burdles of a constitution without against 1, They grous under the burdles of a constitution without against 1, They grous under the burdles of a constitution without against 1, They grous under the burdles of a constitution without against 1, They grous under the burdles of a constitution without against 1, They grous under the burdles of a constitution without against 1, They grous under the burdles of a constitution without against 1, They grous under the burdles of a constitution without a first the position of the English Church!" Was salvanced to excuse the defective organization of the Dutch Churches.

Historicus, as if by a happy stroke of humor, styles the Symod of Dort an "Evangedical Alliance." Very example and the present of the sale of meta-gried indeed! A Symod which condemned and drove out Episcopius and many others for the sale of meta-physical distinctions in the destrine of prodestination; which not only concemned the opinions of those men, but turned them out of their livings and gave them over to crack persecution; which cansed the noble Barne-

persecution; which caused the noble Barne be sent to the scaffold, and the filustrious Hugo veidt to be sent to he scatted, and the marriers hage foroins to be condemned to perpetual imprisonment; which would have driven out (as it did drive the Remonstrants) John Wesley and all his followers, our own Bishop White, and Dr. Milnor and Dr. Sparrow, and thousands of ministers who live righteously and preach Christ cruelified! It is hardly possible to believe that your defender is acquainted with the history of that thousands of ministers who live righteously and preach throusands of ministers who live righteously and preach throusands of ministers who live righteously and preach christ crucified! It is hardly possible to believe that your defender is acquainted with the history of that Synod, whose President (Bogerman) displayed such "immoderate passion" as "scandalized" even some of his own party. His rage against the Araminans was so great that he "could neither compose his constenance nor govern his tongue," and he is described by ecclesiastical historians as having "the soul of an inquisitor!" But he was not alone; "the madman Gomarus, as Balcanquai called him, was a good seconder. In fact, the Synod, like the late Vatican Council, was merely a body convened to give formal sanction to a predetermined sentence. I am not a member of the Evangelical Alliance, nor a believer in the possibility of uniting Christians by the method it has adopted, but I have too much respect for the spirit it has displayed, and for many godly men that are in its ranks, to insult it by applying its name to the Synod of Dord.

Having now disposed of everything in the way of "authority" that you and Historicus have furnished, I proceed to examine the statement found in your extracts from Macasulay, Burnet, and others, viz., that it was only in 1661 or 1662 Episcopal Ordination was declared necessary in the Church of Ergiand. This resilly has as little to do with the question between us as the subject just disposed of. But as it is considered by many to be a sort of justification for the assertion you have attempted to substantiate, I will give it the benefit of discussion. The common saying is that a change was in augurated by the Act of Uniformity, and that the Preface to the Ordinal was altered to correspond with the new law. Dr. Goode said this alteration in the character of the Preface was made by the words! "Or hat had formerly Episcopal Consecration or Ordination" which were then added for the first time.

On the morality of making such r

stand. Of course, Right Rev. Sir., you know that words asserting precisely the same principle had always stood in the Ordinal Preface since the hand of Cranmer put them there in 1549. If you should happen to be unaware of the fact, be so good as to look at Fleetwood's works (which Historicus has quoted) page 554, or Cardwell's Two Books of Common Prayer Compared, or Keeling's Liturgize, or Proctor on the Prayer-Book. From these it will be seen that the form adopted at the

well's Two Books of Common Prayer Compiled, or Keeling's Liturgite, or Proctor on the Prayer-Book. From these it will be seen that the form adopted at the revision in 1652 is in no wise different from or stronger than that which had always been there. The words "or hath had formerely Episcopal Consecration or Ordination" were introduced as somewhat more convenient than those others, "not being at this present Bishop. Priest, or Deacon." So much then for the story that a change in principle took place at that time.

It is thought by some, however, that though the Prayer Book may have remained the same in character that it always had been, the Act of Uniformity did establish a change in practice. In fact it is supposed that such a law never existed before! The statutes at large or any good history will correct that error. The Act of Uniformity passed in the first year of the reign of Eugabeth, and the other of similar character passed in 1572, may be found in any collection of the ecclesiastical laws of England, for instance, in the Clergy man's Assistant (Oxford, 1807).

The often-repeated saying about a new policy having been adopted in 1662 is thus disproved, Burnet, Hallam, and Macaulay to the contrary notwithstanding. Your friend Historicus makes a quotation from Keble, in which another period of change is indicated. He says: "Nearly up to the time that Hooker wrote (1804), numbers had been admitted to the ministry of the Charch of England with no better than Presbylerian ordination." This is regarded as peculiarly valuable testimony, because Mr. Kebie was a friend of Dr. Passy and shared his opinions. Allow me to assure you, Sir, that I am not wining to concede the infailbility of Dr. Pussy or his friends, and that from them as well as others I expect proof of any important statement they make, and I withing to concede the infailbility of Dr. Pussy or his friends, and that from them as well as others I expect proof of any important statement they make, and I within the precent instance Keble gives none. But The latter says that up to learn a common Episcopai divines. Keble said it was so "hearly to the time at which Hooker wrote; that is, 1500-3 There is a slight difference here, Sir; a difference about three generations? Which is correct! With a unquestionable law of the State and the Course testif

for the present. I am, Right Reverend Sir, yours re Bristot, Penn., Oct. 30, 1873. A QUESTION TO DR. DRUMM.

SIR: Why should the writer of "Vox Ecclesia," object to Bishop Cummina's administering the Communion in a Presbyterian Church ! If the rector of the church at Bristol really believes that ours is the only true church, our ministry the only valid ministry, our administration of the sacraments the only way in which Christ hath ordained their sure and certain efficacy, why then object to Bishop Cummins's acta! If he be in the direct line of descent from the aposities, if his office be divinely appointed, if grace flows from his flagers, why then does Dr. Drumm object to the Bishop's giving the sacraments in all their fullness to the Presbyterians and others who are out of the direct line! If a bishop be all that our worthy brother claims, send him around to every meeting house in the land. If Episcopalians alone are divinely appointed to preach, cease persecuting your Tyngs, but send them to every church that will hear them. If we have such a very good thing, let them have it by all means. Let our bishops, priests and deacons get in by hook or by crook and give their blessing and their grace to those who are administering and receiving the sacraments, without God's blessing upon them.

\*\*Trenton\*, N. J., Nov. 1, 1873.\*\* the church at Bristol really believes that ours is the only

Trenton, N. J., Nov. 1, 1873. THE DISCUSSION PRODUCTIVE OF GREAT GOOD. To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: Your remarkably full reports of the Evangelical Alliance have gained for you an enviable reputation among religious people, and one of which I replation along lengths proposed by the struct you will always reap the benefit, for giving the most complete report of a religious gathering of great interest eyer farnished by a daily journal. Will you permit me to add to my thanks for that great enterprise, my gratitude for your coarse in the matter of the Bishop Camerins controversy. You are doing what thousands of Episcopalians have long wished might be done by a daily journal. You are permitting a free and open discussion of both sides of the question of very great importance in their eyes. Out of this discussion vast good must come, for the truth will be elicited. Heretofore the Episcopal Church has been subjected to constant misunderstanding by a want of information among the conductors of the secular press, and their consequent misrepresentation of her position. Hereafter, on the point in which this controversy is concerned, misanderstanding will be impossible, and for this happy result you will deserve our unfeigned thanks. Harlford, Conn., Nov. I. 1873.

A FEW ANALOGIES.

A FEW ANALOGIES. To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sin: The "joint communion" service has atracted so much attention, and been so frequently comented upon, that I venture to add my mite to the dis cussion by way of illustration. Suppose that Dr Ewer, in his capacity as Superior of the Confraternity of the

mented upon, that I venture to add my mito to the discussion by way of illustration. Suppose that Dr Ewer in his capacity as Superior of the Confraternity of the Biessed Sacrament (which has of late been the object of such animadversion on the part of The Independent) had attended Mass at St. Patrick's Cathedral, occupying a prominent position in the front pew, and gone up to receive floly Communion in the hands of the officiating priest, would the outery consequent upon snea an act have ceased till he was driven from his priestly office that have ceased till he was driven from his priestly office that developed the prayer-book which would debar their receiving it. If Dr. McGlyan desired admission into any branch of the Anglean communion to day, he would be re-koased a true and valid priest, and no bishop would think of reordaining blue, and consequently any sacrament administered by him would be valid.

But Dr. Angus and Dr. Admis, as well as all those delegates to the General Convention, who have never received Episcopal ordination, are reckomed by the Aaglean common to the Large, dector or merchant would have. If they desired admission into the Episcopal Church they would have to wait six months before they could be admitted to the lowest grades of the ministry, and a year, or at least six months leaver, before they could be ordained priests, and thus acquire the right of celebrating the Holy Eacharist. If then Bishop Cummins received communion at the bands of any such, he received what he knew that his church reckoned no sacrament.

Or again, suppose that Bishop Potter, arrayed in the gorgeous vestments of the Eastern Church, had assisted Fr. Ejerring in the service at the Rasso-Greek Chapet here, and had distributed hely communion to the worshipers. What would have been said about treason and Jesuits at the Auglean and Eastern Churches has been broached for years past; the PanAngiacan Synod several General Conventions have appointed a committee to discuss the question of union between the two-churches, On

SETTER FROM BISHOP POTTER-THE SUPPOSED PRE ENT IN THE CASE OF THE DEAN OF CAN

The following letter appears in The Evening Post of Monday, Nov. 3:

being a "inasty" letter. It was well considered; and he has been warfully thanked for it by men of the highest character on every side. A similar letter has been addressed to me by one of the ablest and most revered of the English bishops on this continent.

Of course, among persons outside your branch of the Church, and even among some of those within it, there are a plenty of mistakes and misapprehousiofs. Probably I should scarcely have taken the trouble to notice them had it not seemed to me to be due to Bishop Tozer to correct the notion which appears in the arrivel I am referring to, that he sent a copy of his letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury to move his Grace to some act of discipling against the Very Reverend, the Dean Nothing of the sort was intended or desired. Bishop Tozer sent a copy of the letter which he had addressed to me first of all to the Dean himself, because he did not care to send to the bishop of this dioceae a strong protest against the irregular conduct of, a clergyman of his own branch of the Church without at once communicating that protest to the person complained of. And he forwarded a copy of the letter to the Archbishop, because he thought that in such a case—a case in which he had stated to an American bishop his objections to what an English Dean had done in that American diocese—his own ecclesiastical superior ought to be informed of the step he had taken in writing such a letter. I presume he has as little wish or expectation as I have that his Grace will in any way notice the matter. Bishop Tozer feit, and I think felt traity, that his own branch of the church had been misrepresented and compromised by an act of irregularity and discourfesty in one of the dioceses of a sister branch of the church. He felt as I should have felt had I been on a visit in England and found an American elergyman there acting in a way to encourage irregularity and discourfests in one important respect they are not parallel. Dean Alford did indeed exercise his ministry at Berlin in a way not e

known first found its way may have promise to be accident.

It is a pity that amiable and impulsive movements toward what is called unity should so often begin and tend in undutifalness toward one's own spiritual household. For myself, I honor and esteem Christian people wherever I meet them. And there are abundant opportunities for making such feelings of respect and esteem manifest in private, in secal intercourse, in the ordinary concerns of life, without entering into unnatural pary concerns of life, without entering into unnature ecclesiastical unions which compet a sacrifice of trut-and a violation of sacred obligations that have been deand a violation of sacred obligations that have been de-ilberately assumed. The venerable and beloved Bishop white, the first bishop of Pennsylvania, and long the presiding bishop of our branch of the church, and was himself beloved by all sorts and conditions of men, yet in his charges and addresses he repeatedly warned his discuss earlies the church at large against those mixed re-ligious services, those false unions which are at once in-consistent with our principles and obligations, injurious to our welfare, and prejudicial to the cause of true peace and charity.

consistency.

To our welfare, and prejudicial to the cause of true peace and charity.

For genuine unity among all the followers of our Lord I do most fervently long and pray. It is the carnest feeling of our whole communion—the whole Anghean Communion—throughout the world. But the union for which we pray, the union which continually rises up before the louging gaze of our hearts, is not a superficial, halting, half-way union of one small imperfect faction of Christendom; not a mechanical union; not an union from more feeling full of suppression of the truth; so full of jealousies and incompatibilities as to be incapable of seeking consecration for itself in the highest act of our holy religion! Oh no! No anch scheme, of union can answer to our idea of the one fold under the one shepherd. The great dissovered flocks must be brought together in the love of the one truth; in reverence for one order ordained of dissevered nocks must be brought together in the love of the one truth; in reverence for one order ordained of God: "One Lord, one Faith, one Bautism, one God and Father over all!" God, most merciful, will in His own mysterious way perfect His own work. In the mean time we, each one of us, will best promote the great, the unspeakable blessed consummation by doing our duty lovingty, charitably, yet firmly and consistently, "in that state of life to which it hath pleased God to call us." I am fathfully yours, Horario Porrga, Bashop, &c. New-York, New, 1, 1873.

THE FASHIONS.

AUTUMN STYLES.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF OLD CLOTHES-MODES OF THE ANCIENT REGIME REVIVED-NEW REDINGOTES AND LADIES' OVERCOATS-BRIGHTER COLORS IN VOGUE-THE GABRIELLE DRESS-STYLES IN RIB-BONS-RENOVATING SILKS. The philosophy of clothes, ender the treat-

ent of Prof. Teufelsdrockb, as translated by Carlyle, obtains an importance which cannot be overlooked. "Clothes," says the Professor, " have given individuality, distinction, social policy. Clothes have made men us." The Professor maintains that all human earthly interests are hooked up and bottoned together and held up by clothes. Just now, in these troubled times, we profoundly echo Teufolsdrockh, who finds a world of philosophy in old clothes. Notwithstanding this and much more, and although iadies daily assure each other that they expect to be perfect frights" this Winter, New-York is compelled to be dressed, however, in some shape or other. The financial crash has rather demoralized taste in matters of dress, as the taste of Paris in everything relating to the toilet is an essential of New-York life; and as France is returning to first principles in mediæval styles, New-York awaits the result in the matter of costume with the greatest anxiety. The French modistes have already altered the sweep of their cutting shears and now fashion the garments according to the style of the ancient régime; they are aristocratic, scanty, and narrow in skirts as one can conveniently walk in and have scarcely a fold to hide the anatomy of humanity. Therefore, why should one be condemned to the Professor's "old clothes," when a few new ones require absolutely so little material, and prices are so reduced 1

And so Aphrodite dipped herself once more into the sea, and returned with the golden and scarlet days of Autumn to Broadway and the Avenue as to "fresh fields and pastures new." What does she find! For sleeves, there is the stiff, ungraceful sleeve of Catharine de Medici, of which the Medici fraise has been a forerunner. One might as well be incased in armor so much is the symmetry of the arm hidden in the stiff plaits and puffs; there is the châtelaine bag for alimony, just now called the aumônière, suspended in chains of old chased silver from the belt; and to connect the quaint styles we have the fashions of the Bean Brummel of his day, Henry Trois, the son of Catharine, in the perfectly fit ting basque, without wrinkle or seam over the hips, and the erect toque, with pompon of ostrich tips in front, its stiffness in perfect conformity with the other parts of the costume.

coming, equally elegant. The Catharine de Medici, if made of velvet, has a silken collar, curving out like the lip of a sea shell, inside a ruff of slik. This is doubleeasted; the sleeves are of silk, exceedingly stiff, with breasted; the sleeves are of sik, exceedings and plaitings at the wrists and elbows. The Henry Trois, fitting exquisitely to the shape, is also double-breasted, high at the throat. The buttons are small, and embroidered according to the latest style, by hand. There are little pockets on the outside, simply piped to correspond with the edge of the basque. An exceedingly elegant basque, in yet another style, the Directoire, this having the masculine rezers connected to the ruff, and descending from that a deep square collar, something in the fashion of children's sailor collars. The sleeves, lose fitting, have very stiff un-turned cuffs. All of the very newest basques are double-breasted, very long, and made straight around over the hips with a graceful pring. A simple basque made of less costly materials, is double-breasted and trimmed with two rows of butons, with high standing Medici fraise. Another style has little pockets and recers. A peculiarity of the new basques is, that however elaborate the trimming of the skirt, the basques, with the exception of the buttons and ruff, are entirely untrimmed; if of velvet, the edges have a double piping of silk, and the cuffs, sleeves, ruff, and resers are of silk. A very handsome jacket, close-fitting, has double basques, the under ones pointed as the tails of a mau's oat, the upper simulating Louis XIII., the pockets arge, fastened with three buttons. The basque is plaited in the middle, disclosing a lining made of some clicately tinted silk ; there is a pointed berthe, and the deeves are flowing from the elbow, richly trimmed to respond with the berthe and under-basque, with foru oraid and lace. Still another jacket, exceedingly stylish, represents in front a Louif XIV. vest, ornate, with braiding in silken cord corresponding to the color of the material; long basques form the side pieces, with deep pockets in front, while behind the basques are shorter, with trimmed recers and buttons, the fraise being of the same material as the jacket, which is elaborately oralded on the sleeves, back and shoulders in large ara besques. A recently imported dinner toilette had the under-akirt trimmed with two very deep side-plaited flounces ; the overskirt formed a tablier in front, draped into a large panier puff behind. This was all bordered with a recers in slik quilted in fine diamonds, with a scart quilted to match, caught up in the back, descending in long ends pointed and completed with a large tassel; the vest and jacket with deep cuffs and erers had the same quitted trimming. This costume rosy plum-color. The most convenient and economical article of wardrobe is the black silk skirt. With it is worn any and

very style of polonaise, redingote, basque, and overskirt, of any color, any fabric, plain or trimmed; or lack silk petticoat may be varied with one of black finest mohair or alpaea. The long-mooted question as to trimming skirts has been decided so amicably that it is left altogether to the fancy of the wearer. The style of the past season is still so fashionable that one can safety recommend the tablier, covered with narrow, fine, side-plaited flounces, with flounces and large puffs at the back; crescent-shaped folds in velvet or silk in even lines or groups, edged with massive jet fringe. A magnificent visiting dress of black gros grain had the bottom of the front trimmed with wide diagonal pullings alternating with broad silk galloon thickly embroidered with jets; the heading was a straight band of the galloon edged with black lace; above a similar trimming reached the edge of the rounded, deep basques in front, looped high at the sides and fastened behind by broad sashes; over a very deep flounce at the back of the dress fell another from the pauler puff formed by the sashes. The trimming on the body of the basque simulated a fichu in beaded galloon and lace. Another superb dinner dress was of lotos gray in two shades; the front a wide, scanty dounce; above the same width of flounce in five close side plaitings; a narrower scanty flounce above this was headed by a plaited trimming, caught down at regular intervals by a large gros grain ribbon of the same shade in bows with fringed ends. The back was covered with box-plaited flounces set rather far apart, the fourth finishing at the side with a large bow. The rounded overskirt was gracefully draped at the sides, the basque trimmed with cords of silk and large mother-of-pearl outtons. Another style of skirt was trimmed alike, both front and back, with a deep side-plaited flounce, over which fell, at the heading, a gathered narrower flounce a band of faille separates this from two standing ruffes bound with faille a shade lighter. This costume was of cashmere, the redingote being simply trimmed at the edges with a bias band of lighter-hued faille, and ornamented with exidized silver buttons. Unlimited lati tude is allowed in trimming. Gathered silk flounces may be bound with velvet rolled like a thick cording. That American tastes differ from French is shown to

the models of imported costumes above described nearly all adhering to the basque and tunic. The secret of this may be shrewdly imagined from the French lack of embonpoint to which Americans are rather inclined Basques increase the apparent size. Polonaises and redingotes decrease and yield more symmetry to a full figure. The French cling to the wrinkled apron front but we prefer the long, straight, square overskirt, or th Senora polomaise, consisting of a basque back slightly pointed, the fronts descending into two long, straight breadths, which are caught behind together by large bows formed of a breadth of the material; square side pockets and wide cutfs form the ensemble of the simplest yet most attractive polonaise yet invented for street Another square skirt, admirably adapted to a full figure, has two square breadths each side, open in front from the waist, three sides trimmed by a fold of velvet or silk; the two long back breadths, made perfectly straight, are caught up in a deep puff. To be strictly costumed after the last Parisian edicts, skirts must not touch the ground, and are made round without the shadow of a train, narrow and short, three yards and a quarter round being their utmost width; the front breadths must lie flat, kept in utmost width; the front breadths must lie flat, kept in their place by tapes sewed to the second side seams and tied behind. The quaint simplicity of the Directoire costumes are preserved in other styles. Many skirts have a single flounce at the edge, with absolutely plain overskirt, a few folds and buttons on the front and the simple untrimmed basque. Some of Worth's models recently sent over are superb combinations of slik and velvet. The velvet flounces are placed rather scantily on the slik skirt and edged with a narrow slik side-plaiting. One of these dresses is extremely novel in design. Fancy a narrow skirt containing five breadths, a narrow one upon each side, wide gored front breadths, two full back breadths; a seam is thus made in the back, and tais seam opens at soam is thus made in the back, and this seam opens at a certain distance from the bottom, and as the flounce, which passes entirely around the skirt, approaches this space, it is fastened there in three or four deep plaits. This not only gives more fullness, but adds a charming graceful droop to the skirt. The dress above particu-

larized was exquisitely made up in one color of two shades, and ornamented with diamond cut steel buttons. A seanty dress pattern can be economically used in this way and modernized. To those weary of overskirts and overloading of trimming may be recommended the simple Gabrielle dress, with a row of trimming down the front; this trimming may be placed in any shape suiting the lancy. Shel trimming, before mentioned, is very fashionable, and extressely pretty if lined with another color. The entire front of a skirt may be trimmed with diagonal bars, horizontal folds, groups of folds in half diamond or crescent shape, hows made up in loops of lined all ker ribbon lined, platts placed on cross-wise, pulf, fluely shirred, bands of the material piped with silk to correspond or of a lighter that. A trimming may then be placed on to initiate a polonaise in a box plaiting carried around at the back high enough to permit two or more plaitings below. If straight bands are preferred down the front, they can be ornamanted with buttons. These, however, can always be used. The darkest of all shades of gray, called the Oxford, comes in long redungotes or sacques of puritained simplelity, with the long, straight religieuse sleeve. These are trimmed or not; if trimmed, it must be with fur.

Just now a very convenient though certainly masen-line wrap is in vogue, nothing less than a femiline overcon thaving a beague back, with rolling soliar of velvet or silk, and being made of warm diagonal cloth, sloping away in true manly fashion over the hips, disclosing a legitimate walsicoat, with good-sized pockets inserted for change, boot and glove hook, and "sandries." That is made of black drap d' été, cashmere, or velvet, and can be worn with any style of waist, coat, or polonaise. At one of the latest expositions there were superb Dolmans of finest black cloth, some of cashmere perfectly covered with finding done in large arabesques, here and there embroidery in silk dotted in with they jets. These were trimmed with heavy silk and je

les. Nothing can exceed in beauty the antique embroidery

leaves and flowers of wool; it can also be used in the velvety pansy, the hearts of roose, and dainty Margue rites.

Nothing can exceed in beauty the antique embroidery of large stately libes and paims, forms and lichem roose and gladioli, with feathery grasses wrought in thee silk, and glittering here and there with ent jet seed beads. These correspond with the medieval stately grace of costames. There are unmade sleevelest jackets of black glk, elegantly embroidered in shades silks in tambour, each flower and leaf worked in with the colored silks in tint. There were similar jackets in black velvet, elegantly embroidered in black floss. Among other importations for whiter comfort is the real Irish frieze for overdresses. Among new and the importations for dresses comes a polka dotted velvet and cut velvet, in handsome, rich, dark shades, marked down from \$10 to \$5 per yard. These are mostly made up into polonaises to wear with faille skirts, and sleeves of corresponding color. There are very elegant stros grain, with a broad watered stripe in black, and violets possessing or evening the part of the properties of the colors given us by Nature, and wo jet lightly traced as a mostly grade of the received and in patterns on revers and the tablier, yet lightly traced as one progress and the tablier, yet lightly traced as one magnificent side embroading of a peculiar formation of the properties of

been exceeded. The entire face of casamere and cleth wraps is covered with jets and passementeric embroidery; cut diamond steel buttons are very fassionable add very expensive, and there is a rage for a new style of smoked pearl buttons. These also are very costly. Exquisite opera wraps made up into Dolmans of faint pearl but, rose color, occan mist, and patent lavender are embroidered in white silk, edged with swan's down or lovely fluily fringe; again, wrought in an embroidery of face-cut white bagbes and in shaded flosses of the shade of the fabric. The fimal Marska of pale bite Stelltenne, edged with swan's down and white chemile fringe, was marked \$150. A lovely new lace for camel's hair costumes is camel's hair lace, lighter and floor than yak or cluny, at \$1.85 per yard. The fashionable almoner's pouch worn by the chatelatine of medieval days, now called atmoniers, is init ince, lighter and fluor than yak or cinny, at \$185 per yard. The fashionable almoner's ponch were by the chatelaine of medieval days, now called atmobisers, is made of velvet and silk, velvet embroidered by hand, or velvet simply gotten up in hoxagon shape, a little flap being fastened by a jeweled button and suspended by silken cords. The taste for extravagance can be inulized here, too, in the chased silver chains, flagree mixture of silver gilt, and in the material fiself of the atmonier. For the remainer of last year's black silks may be recommended an excellent mode of cleaning. Rub each breadth carefully with a woolen cloth to get the dust from the surface, then sponge it ail off with water in which one or two black kild gloves have been boiled, a quart of water for a pair of gloves; from while wet, with extremely hot froms, on the wrong side. For colored silks, the same colored gloves to be boiled; for this purpose it is well to save old kild gloves of all colors. Another mode tried with great success at the same process of rubbing off the dirt with a woolen raz; then mix an equal quantity of strong tea and vinegar, with which the silk is washed by rubbing it with a piece of flaunel. It must be made very wet. Smooth the silk carefully, folding it, and in ubbing it with a piece of fiannel. It must be made r wet. Smooth the silk carefully, folding it, and in it fifteen minutes iron it on the wrong side with very irons. This applies only to black silk, black rib-s, cravats, but might be injurious to colors.

A BRUTAL SEA CAPTAIN

In the course of the trial of Capt. Clarke, lately convicted in San Francisco of extreme crucity to seamen on board the ship sunrise, the following evidence

August Wiltpfenning, one of the seamen, testified : Corrigan, John Condiff, and Charles Brand wont over

board while at sea, after great sufferings at the hands of

the officers of the ship.